

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/070,569		MURAMATSU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.		1643	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.

(2) Glenn P. Ladwig.

**Date of Interview:** 17 February 2006

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:

1-16

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 4:25pm

  

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicants' representative, Mr. Ladwig in order to discuss claim amendments to claims 1, 9 and 13 and the cancellation of non-elected claims 10-12. The Examiner noted to Mr. Ladwig that while the amendments to claims 1, 9 and 13 were supported by Kaname et al. (Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 219:256-260, 1996), therein the specific portion Asp26 and Gly81 would be regarded as a new contemplation and this language should be omitted. Participants agreed upon new claim language and the Examiner noted the claims were allowable over the prior art..